

Appl. No.: 09/752,058
Amdt. dated June 2, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 21, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant received the Office Action dated April 21, 2004, in which the Examiner: (1) objected to claims 14 and 16 because of certain informalities; (2) rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; (3) rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 20-23 and 25 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mohan; (3) rejected claims 4, 10, 13, 17, 18, and 24 under § 103(a) as being obvious over Mohan; (4) rejected claims 5 and 19 as being obvious over Mohan in view of G-Lock Software; and (5) rejected claim 16 as being obvious over Mohan in view of Gabber.

In this Response, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, and 25 and adds new claims 26-43. Based on the arguments and amendments contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow all pending claims.

I. THE OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claims 14 and 16 because of grammatical errors. Claims 14 and 16 have been amended to correct these grammatical errors as per the Examiner's suggestions. These amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims and fully address the Examiner's objections.

II. THE § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 as allegedly being indefinite for using the term "the internet" throughout the claims instead of "the Internet." Without regard to whether Applicant's usage of the term is indefinite, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 11, 16, 19, and 25 to either change instances of "internet" to "Internet" or to remove the term altogether. The Examiner also rejected claim 3 for insufficient antecedent basis for reciting the limitation "logging in to." Applicant amends claim 1 from which claim 3 depends to remove "logging on to the Internet" and amends claim 3 accordingly to remove "logging in to the internet." These amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims 1 and 3.

Appl. No.: 09/752,058
Amtd. dated June 2, 2004
R ply to Office action of April 21, 2004

III. THE ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner relied on Mohan for the § 102(e) and § 103(a) rejections. Mohan is directed to a client-server independent intermediary mechanism (IIM) that "mediates information exchanged between a client and servers by having the client-server communication pass through the IIM" (page 2, par 36, lines 1-5). A user connects to the IIM through a web browser. The user then connects to a designated destination server through the IIM. From this point, submissions from the web browser to the designated destination server pass through the IIM. Responses from that destination server also pass through the IIM.

Cookie management is performed by the IIM during transactions with the destination server. The IIM intercepts requests for cookies from the destination server and supplies the cookies from IIM cookie database or, optionally, from cookies previously stored by the web browser in the web browser's cookie database. The IIM also intercepts cookies transmitted from the destination server and stores them in the IIM cookie database. See pages 4-5, paras 57-71. Mohan does not describe the IIM as having functionality to receive and store cookies from the web browser when the web browser attempts to store the cookies local to the web browser nor to send cookies to the web browser when the web browser attempts to access cookies stored locally to the web browser. Nor does Mohan describe the IIM as having functionality to download and store the cookies stored in the IIM for local use by the web browser.

The IIM of Mohan also provides functionality permitting a user to manage and use bookmarks maintained within the IIM. See page 3, para 49, lines 1-2, page 5, para 81, lines 6-11, page 8, para 129, and page 8, paras 131-135. Information about bookmarks maintained by the IIM may be sent to a web browser for display but the address corresponding to a bookmark selected from this display is fetched from a bookmark database maintained on the IIM. See page 8, paras 131-134. Mohan does not describe the IIM as having functionality to use, manage, store, intercept, or redirect bookmarks created and maintained using the bookmark interface of a web browser. In addition, Mohan does not

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. N .: 09/752,058
Amdt. dated June 2, 2004
R ply to Office action of April 21, 2004

describe the IIM as having functionality to download and store the bookmark database for local use by the web browser.

Independent method claim 1 has been amended to require that "accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by a web browser" are redirected to a remote nav server. As explained above, Mohan does not teach or suggest redirecting of "accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by a web browser." For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Mohan. Claim 1 has also been amended to remove "logging on to the internet" as this limitation is not needed for patentability. Dependent claim 3 has been accordingly amended to remove reference to this limitation. Claims 30-32 have been added to provide further coverage for Applicant's contributions to the art. Claims 2-10 and newly added claims 30-32 depend on or from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the same reason as claim 1.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to require that the nav module redirects "all accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by the web browser." The term "selectively" is removed from the claim as this limitation is not needed for patentability in light of the other amendments to the claim. As explained above, Mohan does not teach or suggest redirecting of "accesses and writes of navigation data attempted by a web browser." For at least this reason, claim 11 is patentable over Mohan. Claim 11 has also been amended to remove "a computer having access to the internet via a web browser" as this limitation is not needed for patentability. Claim 12 has been amended to remove "remote" as this limitation is not needed for patentability. Claim 19 has been amended to remove "once the internet has been accessed" as this limitation is not needed for patentability. Dependent claim Claims 12-24 depend on or from claim 11 and are allowable at least for the same reason as claim 11.

Independent method claim 25 has been amended to require that downloaded navigation data is "stored locally for subsequent use by a web browser without accessing the remote nav server." As explained above, Mohan does not teach or suggest storing downloaded navigation data "locally for

Appl. No.: 09/752,058
Amdt. dated Jun 2, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 21, 2004

subsequent use by a web browser." For at least this reason, claim 25 is patentable over Mohan. Claims 26-29 have been added to provide further coverage for Applicant's contributions to the art. Newly added claims 26-29 depend on or from claim 25 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 25.

Claims 33-43 have been added to provide further coverage for Applicant's contributions and are allowable over the art of record. Independent claim 33 claims "a method for managing navigation data on the Internet, comprising storing a cookie received from a remote web browser, receiving a request from the remote web browser for the cookie, and sending the cookie to the remote web browser." Mohan neither teaches nor suggests "receiving a request from the remote web browser for the cookie, and sending the cookie to the remote web browser." For at least this reason, claim 33 is patentable over Mohan. Claim 34 depends on or from claim 33 and is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 33.

Independent claim 35 claims "a method for managing navigation data on the Internet, comprising storing a bookmark received from a remote web browser, wherein the bookmark is created using a bookmark interface of the remote web browser, receiving a request for the bookmark from the remote web browser, and sending the bookmark to the remote web browser." Mohan neither teaches nor suggests "storing a bookmark received from a remote web browser, wherein the bookmark is created using a bookmark interface of the remote web browser, receiving a request for the bookmark from the remote web browser, and sending the bookmark to the remote web browser." For at least this reason, claim 35 is patentable over Mohan. Claim 36 depends on or from claim 35 and is allowable for at least the same reason as claim 35.

Independent claim 37 claims a system including "a storage device in which navigation data is stored, a network connection that sends and receives navigation data, and instructions stored in the storage device that cause the system to receive a cookie when a remote web browser attempts to store the

Appl. No.: 09/752,058
Amdt. dated June 2, 2004
Reply to Office action of April 21, 2004

cookie, store the cookie in the storage device, and send the cookie to the remote web browser when the remote web browser attempts to access the cookie." Mohan neither teaches nor suggests a system that receives "a cookie when a remote web browser attempts to store the cookie," stores the cookie in a storage device associated with the system, and sends "the cookie to the remote web browser when the remote web browser attempts to access the cookie." For at least this reason, claim 37 is patentable over Mohan. Claims 38-40 depend on or from claim 37 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 37.

Independent claim 41 claims a navigation server including "a network connection that sends a cookie to a remote web browser, and a storage device in which the cookie is stored, wherein when the remote web browser attempts to access the cookie in a local storage device on a computer where the remote web browser is executing, the navigation server sends the cookie to the remote web browser." Mohan neither teaches nor suggests a navigation server that "sends a cookie to the remote web browser" when "the remote web browser attempts to access the cookie in a local storage device on a computer where the remote web server is executing." For at least this reason, claim 41 is patentable over Mohan. Claims 42-43 depend on or from claim 41 and are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 41.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-

Appl. No.: 09/752,058
Amdt. dated June 2, 2004
R ply to Office action of April 21, 2004

Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400